

Remarks

1. Summary of the Office Action

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 2-5 and 7, and 9-17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,943,620A (“Boltz”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,393,275-B1 (“Alfred”). Additionally, the Examiner rejected claims 6 as unpatentable over Boltz in view of Alfred and further in view of what is well-known in the art and rejected claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Boltz in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0043763 (“Grayson”).

2. Status of the Claims

Presently pending in this application are claims 2-18, of which claims 2, 17, and 18 are independent and the remainder are dependent. The invention as recited in various ways in each of the pending claims provides a method for facilitating operation of multiple subscriber stations under a common subscriber ID. The method generally includes the functions of (i) maintaining a subscriber profile that associates multiple subscriber stations with a common subscriber ID; (ii) wherein only a first subscriber station of the multiple subscriber stations is arranged to respond to a predetermined type of termination signal; (iii) using the subscriber profile to authorize an origination from any of the subscriber stations; and (iv) in response to a request to terminate a predetermined type of communication to the subscriber ID, broadcasting the predetermined type of termination signal keyed to the subscriber ID, whereby only the first subscriber station will respond to the termination signal.

Thus, according to the claims, only one of the multiple subscriber stations associated with common subscriber ID is arranged to respond to the termination signal. Further, the subscriber profile is arranged to authorize an origination from any of the multiple subscriber stations.

3. Response to §103(a) Rejections: Boltz fails to teach *only one* subscriber station being arranged to respond to termination signal.

In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness of a claimed invention by applying a combination of references, the prior art must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. M.P.E.P. § 2143. Applicant respectfully traverses the obviousness rejections because the asserted combinations fail to disclose or suggest the invention as a whole as recited in the claims.

As stated above, the Examiner rejected claims 2-5 and 7, and 9-17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Boltz in view of Alfred, claim 6 as unpatentable over Boltz in view of Alfred and further in view of what is well known in the art, and claims 8 and 18 as unpatentable over Boltz in view of Grayson. In all three sets of rejections, the Examiner relied upon Boltz to teach that only one of the multiple subscriber stations associated with common subscriber ID is arranged to respond to the termination signal. However, this teaching is not found in Boltz (or the other references). Rather, as noted by the Examiner, Boltz discloses having multiple subscriber stations (primary and secondary) arranged to respond in series to a termination signal. Thus, in Boltz, at least two subscriber stations are arranged to respond to the termination signal.

Notice that claim 2 of the present application, for instance, recites that "only a first subscriber station of the multiple subscriber stations is arranged to respond to a

predetermined type of termination signal.” As explained in the specification as filed, one way that a device could be arranged to respond to a MIN-based termination message is for the device to respond to a page message destined to its MIN, while one way that a device could be arranged to not respond to a MIN-based termination message is for the device to ignore a part or all of a page message destined to its MIN. (See pages 9-10 of the specification.)

The combinations of Boltz/Alfred and Boltz/Grayson both fail to teach having multiple mobile stations operate under a common subscriber ID and arranging just one of them to respond to termination signals.

At best, Boltz teaches that two mobile stations may have a common MSISDN number, which is analogous to a common MIN. However, Boltz does not teach that only one of those two mobile stations is arranged to respond to a MIN-based termination message. (For sake of discussion, we can assume that termination messages in Boltz are MIN-based.) In fact, Boltz teaches that *both* the primary mobile station and the secondary mobile station are arranged to respond to MIN-based termination messages, i.e., that both can receive incoming calls. (See column 8, lines 22-49 of Boltz, where Boltz explains that if the primary mobile station is currently busy, an incoming call will be sent to the secondary mobile station instead.) Boltz thus fails to teach restricting registration of mobile stations such that a common MIN is associated with at most one registered mobile station that is arranged to respond to a MIN-based termination message. Further, neither Alfred nor Grayson make up for this deficiency of Boltz.

4. Conclusion

Because the combinations of Boltz/Alfred and Boltz/Grayson both fail to disclose or suggest all the elements of independent claims 2, 17, and 18, Applicant submits that a *prima facie* case of obviousness of those claims and their dependents does not exist.

Respectfully submitted,

**McDONNELL BOEHNEN
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP**

Dated: January 12, 2005

By: 

Dennis D. Crouch
Reg. No. 55,091